

CR 6/12/74
pp H5062-
5067

TRANSMITTAL SLIP		DATE 18 June 1974
TO:	[REDACTED] EA	
ROOM NO. 5E18	Hq	
REMARKS: A copy of this was forwarded to EA earlier; just want to be sure you were aware of it.		
FROM:	[REDACTED] :OLC	
ROOM NO. 7D35	Hq	EXTENSION 6136
FORM NO. 241 1 FEB 55		
REPLACES FORM 36-8 WHICH MAY BE USED.		

(47)

June 12, 1974

Approved For Release 2007/02/07 : CIA-RDP75B00380R000500110005-4

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

115061

tory grounds if it is made available to him?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I understand that he will occupy it if it is made available, because of some of the security problems existing now in his present residence in Alexandria.

Mr. GROSS. However, there is nothing to compel him to move into this residence?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. There is nothing in this legislation, and there is no other compulsory legislation I know of that would require the Vice President to move into this residence.

Mr. GROSS. But there is evidence that he will move into the proposed residence?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I understand there is, yes, sir.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the question has been raised whether the Vice President is aware of this plan, and is there reason to believe he definitely would move in? The answer is the Vice President is aware of the plan and he would move in if the home is made available.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I understand there is evidence to that effect.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Yes, I will yield to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the procedure we are going to follow today is this: Rather than go into the Committee of the Whole, we are going to operate in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

This makes a difference in the time that will be allotted to the Members; in other words, it will be under the 5-minute rule.

I think my good friend, the gentleman from California, realizes that there has to be further explanation of the costs, other than what we have here. This is entirely different from the testimony which was received in the committee. There was an indication that the security costs for the Secret Service would involve about a quarter of a million dollars. There was testimony that further refurbishing of the home would take another quarter of a million dollars, and it wound up as an amount approaching almost \$750,000, which is considerably different from the figure which the gentleman mentioned.

I think we should have a full explanation of these matters somewhere along the line, as to just what the costs will be, and I hope we will have the opportunity during regular debate to get that information, unless the gentleman can answer these questions now.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will allow me to answer, I took the figure from the report, and on page 3 of the report we find this language:

This legislation, as amended, offers several distinct advantages over earlier proposals. Foremost, it will provide an immediate residence for the Vice President at a minimum cost estimated to be \$10 to \$15 thousand.

Mr. Speaker, I took this information from the report. And then on page 4 of the report, we find this language:

The enactment of this legislation will provide an immediate residence for the Vice President with a minimum expenditure of funds, as indicated earlier in this report, of approximately \$48,000.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that down the road there are other plans to be considered.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I understand now that this bill will be considered in the Committee of the Whole and that we will have an opportunity to get a further explanation.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. The gentleman is correct. We will have an opportunity to get further explorations at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 388, nays 4, answered "present" 1, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]
YEAS—388

Abdnor	Brown, Calif.	Cronin
Abzug	Brown, Mich.	Culver
Adams	Brown, Ohio	Daniel, Dan
Addabbo	Broyhill, N.C.	Daniel, Robert
Alexander	Broyhill, Va.	W., Jr.
Anderson,	Buchanan	Daniels,
Calif.	Burgener	Dominick V.
Anderson, Ill.	Burke, Calif.	Danielson
Andrews, N.C.	Burke, Fla.	Davis, S.C.
Andrews,	Burke, Mass.	Davis, Wis.
N. Dak.	Burleson, Tex.	de la Garza
Annunzio	Burlison, Mo.	Delaney
Archer	Burton	Dellenback
Arend	Butler	Dellums
Armstrong	Byron	Denholm
Ashbrook	Camp	Dennis
Ashley	Carney, Ohio	Dent
Aspin	Carter	Devine
Badillo	Casey, Tex.	Dickinson
Bafalis	Chamberlain	Dingell
Baker	Chappell	Donohue
Barrett	Chisholm	Downing
Bauman	Clancy	Drinan
Beard	Clausen,	Dulski
Bell	Don H.	Duncan
Bennett	Clawson, Del	du Pont
Bergland	Clay	Edwards, Ala.
Bevill	Cleveland	Ellberg
Biester	Cochran	Erlenborn
Bingham	Cohen	Esch
Blackburn	Collins, Ill.	Eshleman
Boggs	Collins, Tex.	Evens, Tenn.
Bolling	Conable	Fascell
Bray	Conlan	Findley
Breckinridge	Conte	Fish
Brinkley	Conyers	Fisher
Brooks	Cotter	Flood
Broomfield	Coughlin	Flowers
Brotzman	Craze	Foley

Ford	McCloskey	Roybal
Forsythe	McCollister	Runnels
Fountain	McCormack	Ruppe
Fraser	McDade	Ruth
Frelinghuysen	McEwen	Schmitt
Frenzel	McFall	St Germain
Frey	McKay	Sandman
Freohlich	McKinney	Sarasin
Fulton	McSpadden	Sarbanes
Fuqua	Maddox	Satterfield
Gaydos	Madden	Scherie
Gettys	Madigan	Schneebeli
Gialmo	McDon	Sebelius
Gibbons	Mallary	Seiberling
Gillman	Mann	Shipley
Ginn	Martin, N.C.	Shoup
Goldwater	Mathias, Calif.	Shriver
Gonzalez	Mathis, Ga.	Shuster
Goodling	Mayne	Sikes
Grasso	Mazzoli	Sisk
Green, Greg.	Melcher	Skubitz
Green, Pa.	Metcalfe	Slack
Grieths	Mezvinsky	Smith, Iowa
Gross	Michel	Smith, N.Y.
Grover	Millford	Snyder
Gubser	Miller	Spence
Gude	Mills	Stanton,
Gunter	Minish	J. William
Guyer	Mink	Stanton,
Haley	Mitchell, Md.	James V.
Hamilton	Mitchell, N.Y.	Stark
Hammer	Mizell	Steed
Hamm	Moakley	Steele
Hansmidt	Mollohan	Steelman
Hanley	Montgomery	Stelger, Ariz.
Hanna	Moorhead,	Stelger, Wis.
Hanrahan	Calif.	Stokes
Hansen, Idaho	Moorhead, Pa.	Stubblefield
Hansen, Wash.	Morgan	Studds
Harrington	Mosher	Sullivan
Harsha	Murphy, Ill.	Symington
Hastings	Murtha	Symms
Hawkins	Myers	Talcott
Hays	Natcher	Taylor, Mo.
Hechler, W. Va.	Nedzi	Taylor, N.C.
Heckler, Mass.	Nelsen	Teague
Helms	Nichols	Thomson, Wis.
Helstoski	Nix	Thone
Hicks	O'Brien	Thornton
Hillis	O'Hara	Tiernan
Hinshaw	O'Neill	Towell, Nev.
Hogan	Owens	Traxler
Holt	Parris	Treen
Holtzman	Passman	Udall
Horton	Patman	Ullman
Hosmer	Patten	Van Deerlin
Huber	Perkins	Vander Jagt
Hudnut	Pettis	Vander Veen
Hungate	Peyser	Vanik
Hunt	Pickle	Veysey
Hutchinson	Pike	Vigorito
Ichord	Poage	Waggonner
Jarman	Podell	Waldie
Johnson, Calif.	Powell, Ohio	Walsh
Johnson, Colo.	Preyer	Wampler
Johnson, Pa.	Price, Ill.	Ware
Jones, Ala.	Price, Tex.	Whalen
Jones, N.C.	Pritchard	White
Jones, Okla.	Quie	Whitehurst
Jones, Tenn.	Railsback	Whitten
Jordan	Randall	Widnall
Kahn	Rangel	Wiggins
Kasamauer	Rarick	Williams
Kazerooni	Rees	Wilson, Bob
Kemp	Regula	Wilson,
Ketchum	Reuss	Charles H.,
King	Rhodes	Calif.
Kluczynski	Riegle	Winn
Koch	Ronald	Wolf
Kuykendall	Roberts	Wright
Kyros	Robinson, Va.	Wylder
Lagomarsino	Rodino	Wylie
Landgrebe	Roe	Wyman
Landrum	Rogers	Yates
Latta	Roncallo, Wyo.	Yatron
Leggett	Roncallo, N.Y.	Young, Alaska
Lehman	Rooney, Pa.	Young, Fla.
Lent	Rose	Young, Ga.
Litton	Rosenthal	Young, Ill.
Long, La.	Rostenkowski	Young, S.C.
Long, Md.	Roush	Young, Tex.
Lott	Roussellot	Zablocki
Lujan	Roy	Zell
Luken		Zwag
McClory		

NAYS—4

Eckhardt Schroeder Wilson, Charles, Tex.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Murphy, N.Y.

Approved For Release 2007/02/07 : CIA-RDP75B00380R000500110005-4

H 5062

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

June 12, 1974

25X1

NOT VOTING—40

Blaggi	Diggs	Moss
Blatnik	Dorn	Pepper
Boland	Evans, Colo.	Quillen
Bowen	Flynt	Reid
Brademas	Gray	Robison, N.Y.
Brasco	Hébert	Rooney, N.Y.
Breaux	Henderson	Staggers
Carey, N.Y.	Hollfield	Stephens
Cederberg	Howard	Stratton
Clark	Maraziti	Stuckey
Collier	Martin, Nehr.	Thompson, N.J.
Corman	Matsunaga	Wyatt
Davis, Ga.	Meeds	
Derwinski	Minshall, Ohio	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Davis of Georgia.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Corman.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Breaux.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Stratton.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Stuckey.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Blatnik.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Bowen.
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Meeds with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Bohnd with Mr. Evans of Colorado.
Mr. Blaggi with Mr. Gray.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Hollfield.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Maraziti.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Robison of New York.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Quillen.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 14592 TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR ARMED FORCES AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 14592) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1975 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces and of civilian personnel of the Department of Defense, and to authorize the military training student loads and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illi-

nois? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HÉBERT, PRICE of Illinois, FISHER, BENNETT, STRATTON, BRAY, ARENDS, BOB WILSON, and GUBSER.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF ARMY TO PERMIT ONE CITIZEN OF LAOS TO ATTEND U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 876) authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the U.S. Military Academy one citizen of the Kingdom of Laos, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 876

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to permit within eighteen months after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, one person, who is a citizen of the Kingdom of Laos, to receive instruction at the United States Military Academy, but the United States shall not be subject to any expense on account of such instruction.

SEC. 2. Except as may be otherwise determined by the Secretary of the Army, the said person shall, as a condition to receiving instruction under the provisions of this joint resolution, agree to be subject to the same rules and regulations governing admission, attendance, discipline, resignation, discharge, dismissal, and graduation, as cadets at the United States Military Academy appointed from the United States, but he shall not be entitled to appointment to any office or position in the Armed Forces of the United States by reason of his graduation from the United States Military Academy, or subject to an oath of allegiance to the United States of America.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FISHER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 876, which would permit one person on a one-time basis who is a citizen of the Kingdom of Laos to receive instruction at the U.S. Military Academy without expense to the United States. The nominee would be subject to the same rules and regulations governing admission and attendance at West Point as those cadets appointed from the United States, but he would not be entitled to any office or position in the Armed Forces or be subject to an oath of allegiance to the United States of America.

As I am sure you know, Mr. Speaker, such legislation is not unique. Over the years Congress has authorized the attendance of foreign students from friendly nations to attend our service academies on an individual one-time basis, and in other instances on a year-to-year basis. Under various provisions of law the President has been authorized

to designate up to four persons at any one time from the Republic of the Philippines to attend the service academies. Similarly, the President is authorized to designate not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics for attendance at the academies.

Most recently, in 1973 by virtue of Public Law 93-164 the Congress authorized two citizens of the Empire of Iran to receive instruction at the Naval Academy on a one-time basis.

On May 14, 1974, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel, of which I am chairman, held hearings on this resolution and heard testimony from the Department of the Army on behalf of the Department of Defense urging that the resolution be favorably considered. Since the appointment of such a cadet would form a favorable basis for professional training among military officers of Laos and certainly would enhance the relationship between the United States and that country, the subcommittee favorably reported the resolution and, in turn, the House Armed Services Committee on May 23, 1974, recommended enactment without amendment.

An outstanding candidate has been selected by the Kingdom of Laos in the event this resolution is enacted and we understand the young man is qualified in all respects for appointment to the Military Academy.

Therefore, I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution will be overwhelmingly approved.

I might add at this point that a similar measure has already been unanimously approved by the other body.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield very briefly?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Since this young foreign citizen would not be required to take the oath of allegiance to this country, is it to be assumed that he would not be required under any circumstance to fight in any war, if this country should become involved?

Mr. FISHER. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of House Joint Resolution 876 and I join Congressman FISHER, our subcommittee chairman, in his request for favorable action for this measure, which would provide for the attendance of a citizen of Laos on a one-time basis at the U.S. Military Academy. I certainly recommend this resolution for passage, not only because I believe it would have positive results for the Laotian Army but also because I believe the Kingdom of Laos have selected an outstanding candidate to fill the appointment if this legislation is enacted into law.

As our subcommittee chairman has indicated, the young man selected by the Kingdom of Laos, Mr. Vang Chong, has all of the attributes which would indicate his success as a cadet at West Point. His father, Maj. Gen. Vang Pao, has established an enviable record as a professional soldier in the Laotian Army and has received high tribute from members

June 12, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 5063

of the House Armed Services Committee who visited with him in Laos.

Vang Chong graduated with honors from Staunton Military Academy in Staunton, Va., and has been recommended by the headmaster in the strongest of terms. The headmaster has informed us that Vang Chong's attendance at the Academy has been marked with notable scholastic achievement and that he rose to the rank of cadet major during his matriculation there. He has been indorsed by his school with the strongest possible recommendation for admission to the Military Academy.

Mr. Speaker, over the years since 1816 foreign students from some 29 countries have been authorized to attend the Military Academy at West Point and I believe the results have been generally beneficial for those students, their countries and the United States. Of the 210 cadets admitted over that span 144 graduated and presently there are 22 in attendance. As noted, this authorization would be at no expense to the United States and certainly the facts we have presented here today would indicate that considerable mutual benefit could flow from enactment of House Joint Resolution 876. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this resolution.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WALDIE. Do I understand this is the son of Gen. Vang Pao?

Mr. DICKINSON. That is right.

Mr. WALDIE. He was a general in the Meo army?

Mr. DICKINSON. I do not have any knowledge of that.

Mr. WALDIE. It has been alleged he is a general of the Laotian Army and it is my understanding the Meo army was the army employed by the CIA and he was not a member of the Royal Laotian Army; is that correct?

Mr. DICKINSON. I do not have any knowledge whether it is correct or not.

Mr. WALDIE. I wonder if there is a member of the committee that could respond to this question?

Mr. FISHER. I will be pleased to inform the gentleman from California that the general he refers to is now attached to the Royal Laotian Army in the capacity of a general and in charge of Laos Military Region II in that country.

Mr. WALDIE. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. WALDIE. Has that been a recent development? As I recall, Gen. Vang Pao was a general in the Meo army under the employ of the Central Intelligence Agency and not with the Laotian Army.

Mr. FISHER. That was some time ago when the Laotian irregulars fought so well against the North Vietnamese. He is now one of the principal officers in the Royal Laotian Army.

Mr. WALDIE. Does the Royal Laotian Government approve of this nominee?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, indeed, and this nominee has been chosen by the Royal Government of Laos.

Mr. WALDIE. Is that the new Government of Laos?

Mr. FISHER. That is the present government.

Mr. WALDIE. Is that a coalition government?

Mr. FISHER. A coalition government; that is correct.

Mr. WALDIE. Is that reflected in the hearings before the committee?

Mr. FISHER. I am sure it is reflected in the hearings and committee records.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. I think that this is an appropriate manner of giving due recognition to the Kingdom of Laos and also to affirm our support for the loyal services rendered to this Nation by Laotian Gen. Vang Pao.

The prospective candidate, Vang Chong, is the son of Gen. Vang Pao and is an outstanding young man, who has accredited himself very well in the Staunton Military Academy which he is presently attending. The adoption of this resolution should help to bring both of our nations closer together. I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. DICKINSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House today to oppose House Joint Resolution 876 on several grounds. Those who would support this legislation argue that it is a good will gesture in keeping with our past policy of training selected foreign nationals at our service academies. Yet, in truth, such an action is at odds with our present foreign policy which pledges our withdrawal from involvement in the military affairs of other nations. Since President Nixon has articulated this position, sending a foreign national to our service academies would only perpetuate the kind of foreign commitment we are anxious to avoid. It certainly would intensify, rather than reduce, our involvement in Indochina.

Little opposition was encountered last year when the House passed a bill allowing two Iranian nationals to attend the Naval Academy. At that time, even a ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee such as I was unaware that the legislation was contrived because of a commitment that Admiral Zumwalt made to the Iranian Government. A similar situation exists today when Gen. Vang Pao, the commanding general of military region II in Laos, has elicited a promise from either the State or Defense Department that the necessary legislation would be passed to allow his son to attend the Academy.

Furthermore, the Government of Laos is not democratic, including as it does Communist Party members in leadership

positions. I find it unconscionable to train persons who would serve such a government especially since U.S. military academies have in the past educated young people from Chile and Greece. These young men graduated only to return to their home countries where they joined armies which overthrew their own governments. I think it folly for the United States to be associated with training persons who would use this training for such illegal ends. A present situation points up this real problem: With 25 foreign cadets enrolled in our Naval Academy, a number of whom are Latin American, it is ironic to realize that these young men will join those same South American naval forces which are raiding our tuna boats.

If we deny allowing this one Laotian to attend the Military Academy, this will not mean that he—or other foreign nationals—is unable to receive military training in the United States. Various NROTC colleges and universities accept foreign nationals in their programs—at a cost to the students, of course. And, whatever the merits of allowing this young man to enter our Military Academy in order to improve the defense capability of an allied nation, the method of selection is obviously arbitrary and should be thoroughly reviewed by Congress.

Should precious slots in the academies be taken by foreign nationals at the expense of members of America's minority communities? I think not, especially at a time when minority representation in the officer corps lags behind minority presence in the enlisted ranks. It is deplorable that Congress would even consider special legislation to assist a foreign national to attend the very military academies which have barred admission to American women.

Since the academies have stated, in a form letter, that the acceptance of a female nominee is "contrary to the national interest," I find it inconsistent that foreign nationals from totalitarian countries would be accepted. The House Armed Services Committee is now holding hearings on allowing women to attend our service academies, a policy change which I believe is greatly desired if we hope to upgrade the capacity of our all-volunteer Army, until women and other minority groups are given appointments to our service academies, I see no justification whatsoever for admitting any foreign nationals.

For the above reasons, I urge your vote against House Joint Resolution 876. If you vote for this legislation, you are voting to continue military involvement in Southeast Asia as well as discrimination against women and minorities in our armed services.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. I will be pleased to yield to my colleague.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and urge defeat of this bill.

When I in my own district and I am sure many Members in their districts have valid and worthy young men and

H 5064

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD -- HOUSE

June 12, 1974

young women who would like to attend the service academies and there is not room for them, I cannot countenance our going along with a deal made by the CIA or the Army in a clandestine fashion to sneak through a foreign national who would replace a constituent of mine.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's vision and foresight in calling this to our attention.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, to respond to the gentleman, I am sorry I did not have the vision the gentleman had a year ago when he opposed the entrance of two Iranians. He was a voice in the dark at that time. There were only 24 votes against that legislation, and I hope there will be a much larger number in opposition today.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUNT. Did I understand my colleague to say that he is going to oppose the entrance of any national of any country to a U.S. academy, which will afford them entrance so they might go back with American ideas to their country and create a better atmosphere in their country?

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Very likely I will. I am very disappointed in what happened in South America. We have had this problem with the navies of Chile, Ecuador, and Peru raiding our fishing vessels in South and Central American waters and on many occasions graduates of our Naval Academy have participated in these illegal acts as members of their naval forces.

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

I rise in opposition to this resolution that would allow a citizen of the Kingdom of Laos to attend the U.S. Military Academy.

Given the Department of Defense's position against admitting women to our academies, I find this resolution flying in the face of DOD's own stated policies. I have witnessed on occasion the Pentagon's ingeniousness in twisting official policies to fit political convenience, but this must rank among the top.

I will quote from two official Pentagon documents. The first is from the Department of Defense's unfavorable report on bills that would allow women admission to the academies. It says, in part:

There is a great demand for the services of graduates of the three service academies. For example, at the Naval Academy, the academic program is designed to train men for duty at sea by developing in them a solid foundation for seagoing skills. Similarly, the Military and Air Force academies mission is to produce male officers to fill combat billets. It is imperative that the maximum enrollment of males who may acquire this training be maintained. The current facilities at the academies are such that to admit females would be to reduce, by the number admitted, the number of critically needed males who receive this education.

The second document is the Army's letter endorsing this resolution which appears in the committee report. It says, in part:

This person shall not be entitled to appointment to any office or position in the Armed Forces of the United States by reason of his graduation from the United States Military Academy, or subject to an oath of allegiance to the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, if it is so critical and imperative to deny admission of women (when the Army admits they can now fill at least 85 percent of its officer positions) because we must produce male officers to fill combat billets, then now can we allow admission of this young Laotian when clearly he will never even serve with U.S. forces? Certainly this is sexual discrimination in its most blatant form.

While I am on the subject of admitting women to our service academies, I would like to share with my colleagues a small item that appeared in the latest issue of Newsweek:

The politics of impeachment may have forced President Nixon to do an about-face in a cause he has long championed: the admission of women to the military academies. Any such move is stoutly opposed by conservatives on Congress's armed-services committees—whom the President is counting on to defend him against impeachment. Mr. Nixon told his civil-rights advisers that although he favored the admission of cadettes, he would not fight the conservatives over the issue.

As this item represents, I suppose, a backdoor Presidential endorsement of the idea of allowing women into the academies, I certainly welcome it. I will only note in passing that the Senate led by Senator HATHAWAY and with the specific endorsement of Senators STENNIS, THURMOND and DOMINICK, chairman and ranking members of the Senate Armed Services Committee, has already gone on record as favoring the admission of women to the academies.

Beyond the issue of discrimination, affecting members of our minority communities as well as women, there are other serious matters to be addressed in considering this resolution. On April 5, 1974, Prince Souphanouvong head of the Pathet Lao, and Prince Souvanna Phouma, head of the Royal Laotian Government, signed an accord creating a coalition government in Laos. This accord ends almost a decade of fighting between the two forces, which has left one-half of the 3 million population as refugees. Contrary to the Army's opinion, I do not see how the West Point training of this young Royal Laotian General's son would enhance the relationship between the United States and the emerging coalition government of Laos.

Finally, we are currently having some good hearings on bills that would allow women into the military academies, but in good conscience I simply cannot support a resolution that would allow any foreign national to attend our academies when the majority of our own population is denied admission.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

The United States has, through many administrations, taken students from abroad into its military academies. This is customary in countries throughout the world. Whether the admission of foreign students is a good idea or not is not at issue. Perhaps legislation could be introduced and discussed and studied as to whether our country could continue this policy. But at this time to practically insult a country that is friendly to the United States by repudiation of a policy that has been in existence for many years is unthinkable and would do insult in a manner that I do not believe this body would want to do.

Mr. Speaker, the appointment of foreign students in our academies has been before us many times without being objected to. Maybe it should, and maybe we should adopt a policy not to accept cadets from other countries, but that is something that we should not try to go into at this time.

Mr. Speaker, it will be a rank insult to another country if we vote this matter down.

Let us proceed with this in an orderly manner.

I can say that as ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, if any member wants to introduce such legislation, I am sure we could get a hearing on this matter.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I just wish to make this observation: Every time something comes up on this floor that is designed to benefit the military of this country or to enhance our relationship with a friendly nation, we get this unmitigated attack upon the CIA. Some Members must have a distinct fetish. Perhaps some day they will understand what the CIA has done for this Nation. They get up on the floor of the House and make allegations that there has been a deal with the CIA, and yet they do not have one scintilla of evidence to support it. It is merely a mouthing off and a release of intemperate remarks by some Members who want to attack the CIA and the military in order to feather their own nests. One can always be sure of the onslaught during an election year.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to close by saying that we have accepted foreign students in the Military Academy since 1916. If we want to stop that practice, we should do so in the orderly way. Let us not insult a friendly country.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, most of the objections that have been raised here are not valid and are probably the result of a lack of understanding as to how the system works.

The admission of a foreign student from Laos will not deprive any student in America of admission to any of the academies. It cannot, and it would not. Those who are laboring under that misapprehension have unfortunately simply not done their homework.

June 12, 1974

H 5065

It was said here that this particular selection was objectionable, because, as the gentleman from California said, Gen. Vang Pao of Laos has received a commitment from either the State Department or the Defense Department that this legislation would be enacted. For that reason, the gentleman from California opposes legislation to make the son of General Pao admissible.

Let us see for a moment who General Pao is. It is true that the general's son 19 years old and an honor student, has been nominated by the Royal Laotian Government for this cadetship if this legislation is enacted.

Mr. Speaker, General Pao is one of the strongest anti-Communist military leaders in Laos. Let us talk a little bit further about this fellow, General Pao, the father of the young man who would be admitted, the young man who is an honor student from Staunton Military Academy. Some Members seem to be very disturbed about General Pao.

I will ask the Members to listen to this: The general's military career began at the age of 13 as an interpreter to the Free French officers and the men who parachuted onto the Plain of Jars during World War II. There he was very helpful in fighting and deceiving the Japanese, who were our enemies, even though he was then in his early teens.

After World War II General Pao performed brilliantly with the French against the Communist guerrillas. He was trained and commissioned by the French and thereafter served with great courage and valor against Communist aggressors in defense of his own country.

Listen to this: The general is credited with saving a number of American lives during the invasion by Communists of South Vietnam, and in rescue work.

It is well known that Pao is very pro-American and very anti-Communist. We cannot repay the General or his confederates for what they did for Americans, but we can today extend to him and to his government a common courtesy by admitting his son to the U.S. Military Academy, with no cost to our Government.

I remind the Members again, Mr. Speaker, that an identical bill has already been approved unanimously by the other body.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the gentleman did not feel by my remarks I was being derogatory toward the General. I just think that this is a poor way to appoint someone to the Military Academy. I have no question about the heroic acts of General Pao; I have no question about his friendship toward our country.

Yet I suppose if we looked at all of the countries we have been allied with in various wars—and there are probably thousands and thousands of people with similar backgrounds—we would see that this is not a proper way to appoint someone to a military academy, by rewarding

a general who has been friendly with us by appointing his son to the academy.

As I said before, let us give him a medal if you want to.

Mr. FISHER. Well, I think everyone is entitled to his view.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

(Ms. ABZUG asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues indicated he felt it would be an insult to the Laotians or to this particular Laotian general and his son if we did not permit him into our military academy. I merely ask a rhetorical question: What about the insult to our own American women who are still denied admission to all of our military academies?

I feel there is a great deal of hypocrisy about this issue as to whether or not our military academies are available to those who have served in other places when we do not even provide ways in which citizens of this country—53 percent of them, having a vote, by the way—will be admitted. They still are denied normal access.

I find it quite reprehensible, I must say, in the sense that this is strictly a special-interest bill which is totally unjustified with regard to our own land. Even though there may have been a practice of admitting foreign nationals, I think this has been an incorrect practice. Why should we admit a foreign national to West Point when the Pentagon continually insists that women will waste space in the academies because, unlike men, they will not be trained for combat duty in the defense of the United States?

Neither will the applicant in question. At least, I hope you will not try to train him for combat duty in our forces.

I submit this legislation adds insult to injury. I suggest that we cannot be asked in this House to pass over those American women who, although I may not be, are ready, willing, and able to serve in the academy at West Point. I am too old and I do not think I am trainable in that direction at this point. In any case, if my country needed me in case of attack, I would be there just like the rest of you. Nevertheless I say to you that to admit a young Laotian to West Point is unconscionable, and I strongly urge the defeat of this joint resolution.

I do not understand why you want to give military training to this young man whose father happens to be—and I only allege this on the basis of hearsay—a general of a tribe which is currently engaged in hostilities in northern Laos. Admitting his son to West Point might be construed as yet another instance of American intervention in the affairs of these countries in Southeast Asia, particularly since a coalition government now exists in Laos.

We have important business to conduct, gentlemen. Why not vote this bill down and get on to the business of taking care of the needs of the American people, the men and women of our country, who are in need of attention, in-

stead of playing these ridiculous war games that are an insult to our intelligence?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 876. I will be brief in my remarks.

I might say to my colleagues that I, too, serve on this subcommittee. We had extensive hearings on this bill. Those who have opposed the bill, not on the committee, did not appear before the committee to testify against the bill.

As to the statements of the gentleman from New York, in this same subcommittee we are holding extensive hearings on admitting women into the academies, and we should have some type of report on this bill in the very near future.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker—and this has been touched on before—that there will be no additional cost to the taxpayers of this country to admit this Laotian into the academy. This young man will have to be mentally and physically qualified just like any other cadet or any other applicant to the academy.

I would like to say that the Kingdom of Laos is a friendly nation. And they have been very helpful to us during our trying times in the Far East.

This is a one-time basis resolution. It cannot occur again unless we pass other legislation.

In closing, on this last point, Mr. Speaker, I think it is good that we have talked about Gen. Vang Pao, because I think the general is entitled to some recognition in this country because of the way that he has helped Americans. For instance, we had many Americans who were shot down over Laos, and if it had not been for Gen. Vang Pao some of these Americans would not have survived, and they would probably be dead or listed as MIA in Laos.

So I am glad that this has been pointed out by our colleagues concerning this great Laotian man.

I certainly hope the Members will support this resolution.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from Mississippi and associate myself with his remarks. Laos is indeed our friend and deserves better treatment from the Congress of the United States than some of those remarks seem to indicate.

It was said a bit earlier in the debate that Gen. Vang Pao was engaged in hostilities in Laos. Of course, he was defending his country from the Communist insurgency. What was not said was, that those hostilities were precipitated by the Pathet Lao, the Communist rebels of Laos, a revolution supported and exported by the North Vietnamese. Gen. Vang Pao and the Meo tribesmen, whom I met on my trip to Laos in 1971, have attempted to protect their own country from the same type of Communist insur-

H 5066

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 12, 1974

agency being carried on in other Southeast Asian countries through the support of Hanoi. It seems to me rather than chastising Gen. Vang Pao, he should be applauded for his contributions to the cause of free Laos which shows that he is on the side of freedom, not totalitarianism and that he hardly deserves the type of remarks that have been made in the Chamber here today. These people have bravely defended their peaceful country for years against the Communists who used their children for carrying North Vietnamese supplies down the Ho Chi Minh trail. No wonder there were hostilities, least they were defensive in nature.

Again I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me this is an act of international good will and will not prevent any U.S. appointees from attending our academies.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his very strong remarks.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, Vang Chong, the 19-year-old son of Maj. Gen. Vang Pao, commander of Laos Military Region Two, is applying for admission in the U.S. Military Academy class of 1978.

I have met Gen. Vang Pao in the presence of the Ambassador and consider the general to be an excellent citizen in every way. Gen. Vang Pao's long years of determined and often successful struggle against some of the best regiments of the North Vietnamese Army are well known. His combat against communism and the Communists in northern Laos began from the early age of 13 years, and endured through decades of warfare. Since 1960, at a crucial point in the U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia, he has assisted in the pursuance of U.S. Southeast Asian policy. Military analysts recognize that Vang Pao's skillful organization and tactical use of the Meo irregulars forced the North Vietnamese to assign most of two infantry divisions to North Laos—units which would otherwise have been free to oppose American soldiers in South Vietnam. He also developed a search-and-rescue capability in northern Laos which resulted in the successful pickup of numerous American airmen downed behind enemy lines.

Vang Chong has exemplified his father's traits during his years at the Staunton Military Academy, Staunton, Va., where he has been for the past 4 years. He is a cadet captain, a member of the honor society, and is also the S-2 officer of the corps of cadets. His grades are generally high and he has the enthusiastic respect of his instructors.

I heartily commend this young man for his academic achievements. I urge my colleagues to support House Joint Resolution 876.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the joint resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the

Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 294, nays 101, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 291]

YEAS—294

Abdnor	Eshleman	Madden
Addabbo	Evans, Colo.	Madigan
Alexander	Fascell	Malone
Anderson, Ill.	Findley	Mallory
Andrews,	Fish	Mann
N. Dak.	Fisher	Maraziti
Annunzio	Flood	Martin, N.C.
Archer	Flowers	Mathias, Calif.
Arends	Foley	Mayne
Armstrong	Ford	Melcher
Ashbrook	Forsythe	Michel
Ashley	Foundation	Milford
Bafalis	Frelinghuysen	Mills
Baker	Frenzel	Minish
Barrett	Frey	Mitchell, N.Y.
Baumman	Fulton	Mizell
Beard	Fugua	Mollohan
Bell	Gaydos	Montgomery
Bennett	Gilman	Moorhead,
Bergland	Goldwater	Calif.
Blester	Gonzalez	Moorhead, Pa.
Bingham	Goodling	Morgan
Blackburn	Grasso	Murphy, Ill.
Boggs	Green, Oreg.	Murphy, N.Y.
Bolling	Griffiths	Murtha
Bray	Gross	Myers
Breckinridge	Grover	Natcher
Brinkley	Gubser	Nedzi
Broomfield	Gunter	Nelsen
Brotzman	Guyer	Nichols
Brown, Mich.	Haley	Nix
Brown, Ohio	Hamilton	O'Brien
Broyhill, N.C.	Hammer-	O'Hara
Broyhill, Va.	schmidt	O'Neill
Buchanan	Hanley	Pasman
Burgener	Hanna	Patten
Burke, Mass.	Hansen, Idaho	Perkins
Burleson, Tex.	Harsha	Pettis
Burlison, Mo.	Hastings	Peyser
Butler	Hays	Pickle
Byron	Heinz	Pike
Camp	Henderson	Poage
Carter	Hicks	Podell
Casey, Tex.	Hillis	Powell, Ohio
Chamberlain	Hinshaw	Preyer
Chappell	Hogan	Price, Ill.
Clancy	Holt	Price, Tex.
Clausen,	Horton	Quie
Don H.	Hosmer	Railsback
Clawson, Del.	Huber	Randall
Cleveland	Hudnut	Regula
Cochran	Hunt	Rhodes
Cohen	Hutchinson	Rinaldo
Collins, Tex.	Ichord	Roberts
Conable	Jarman	Robinson, Va.
Conlan	Johnson, Calif.	Rodino
Conte	Johnson, Pa.	Roe
Cotter	Jones, Ala.	Rogers
Coughlin	Jones, N.C.	Roncalio, Wyo.
Crane	Jones, Okla.	Roncalio, N.Y.
Cronin	Kazen	Rooney, Pa.
Culver	Kemp	Rose
Daniel, Dan	Ketchum	Rousselot
Daniel, Robert	King	Roy
W. Jr.	Kluczynski	Runnels
Daniels,	Kuykendall	Ruth
Dominick V.	Lagomarsino	Sandman
Davis, S.C.	Latta	Sarasin
Davis, Wis.	Leggett	Satterfield
de la Garza	Lehman	Scherie
Delaney	Lent	Schneebell
Dellenback	Long, La.	Sebellus
Dennis	Lott	Shoup
Dent	Lujan	Shriver
Devine	McClary	Shuster
Dickinson	McCollister	Sikes
Dingell	McCormack	Sisk
Donohue	McDade	Skubitz
Downing	McEwen	Slack
Duncan	McFall	Smith, Iowa
Edwards, Ala.	McKay	Smith, N.Y.
Erlenborn	McSpadden	Snyder
Esch	Macdonald	Spence

Stanton,	Towell, Nev.	Wilson, Bob
J. William	Traxler	Winn
Stanton,	Treen	Wolfe
James V.	Udall	Wright
Steed	Ullman	Wylder
Steele	Vander Jagt	Wyllie
Steiger, Ariz.	Vanik	Wyman
Stratton	Veysey	Yatron
Stubblefield	Vigorito	Young, Alaska
Symington	Waggonner	Young, Fla.
Symms	Walsh	Young, Ga.
Talcott	Wampler	Young, Ill.
Taylor, Mo.	Ware	Young, S.C.
Taylor, N.C.	White	Young, Tex.
Teague	Whitehurst	Zablocki
Thomson, Wis.	Whitten	Zion
Thone	Widnall	Zwach
	Williams	

NAYS—101

Abzug	Gude	Rangel
Adams	Hanrahan	Rarick
Anderson,	Harrington	Reuss
Calif.	Hawkins	Riegle
Andrews, N.C.	Hechler, W. Va.	Rosenthal
Aspin	Heckler, Mass.	Rostenkowski
Badillo	Helstoski	Roush
Bevill	Holifield	Roybal
Brooks	Holtzman	Ruppe
Brown, Calif.	Johnson, Colo.	Ryan
Burke, Calif.	Jones, Tenn.	St. Germain
Burke, Fla.	Jordan	Sarbanes
Burton	Karh	Schroeder
Carney, Ohio	Kastenmeyer	Seiberling
Chisholm	Koch	Shipley
Clay	Kyros	Stark
Collins, Ill.	Landrum	Steelman
Conyers	Litton	Stephens
Corman	Long, Md.	Stokes
Danielson	Lukens	Stuckey
Delums	McCloskey	Studds
Denholm	Mathis, Ga.	Sullivan
Drinan	Mazzoli	Thompson, N.J.
Dulski	Metcalfe	Thornton
du Pont	Mezvinaky	Tierney
Eckhardt	Miller	Van Deerlin
Edwards, Calif.	Mink	Vander Veen
Ellberg	Mitchell, Md.	Waldie
Evins, Tenn.	Moakley	Whalen
Fraser	Mosher	Wilson,
Gettys	Obeys	Charles H.,
Gialmo	Owens	Calif.
Gibbons	Parris	Wilson,
Ginn	Patman	Charles, Tex.
Green, Pa.	Pritchard	Yates

NOT VOTING—38

Biaggi	Diggs	Meeds
Blatnik	Dorn	Minshall, Ohio
Boland	Flynt	Moss
Bowen	Froehlich	Pepper
Brademas	Gray	Quillen
Brasco	Hansen, Wash.	Rees
Breaux	Hébert	Reid
Carey, N.Y.	Howard	Robison, N.Y.
Cederberg	Hungate	Rooney, N.Y.
Clark	Landgrebe	Staggers
Collier	McKinney	Wiggins
Davis, Ga.	Martin, Nebr.	Wyatt
Derwinski	Matsunaga	

So the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Rees against.
Mr. Biaggi for, with Mr. Diggs against.
Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Flynt against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Boland with Mr. Gray.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Blatnik.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Froehlich.
Mr. Howard with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Mr. Hungate with Mr. Landgrebe.
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. McKinney.

Mr. Moss with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.

Mr. Meeds with Mr. Quillen.

Mr. Brademas with Mr. Robison of New York.

Mr. Bowen with Mr. Wiggins.

Mr. Breaux with Mr. Wyatt.

June 12, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 5067

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 1168, I call up for immediate consideration the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 206) authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the U.S. Military Academy one citizen of the Kingdom of Laos.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House joint resolution (H.J. Res. 876) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate joint resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. O'NEILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor to make two announcements.

Tomorrow, we will have the annual Flag Day celebration and ceremony. Our honored guest will be Hank Aaron, who is a great American and a legendary baseball star. The leaders on both sides of the aisle would appreciate a full attendance by the Members for the ceremony which we have scheduled.

Mr. Speaker, may I also say with regard to my second announcement, that we had reported earlier during the year that we would adjourn for the 4th of July weekend from Wednesday until noon on Monday.

Mr. Speaker, it is the intent of the leadership on both sides to ask that on the 4th of July weekend we adjourn from July 3 until noon on Tuesday, July 9, instead of Monday, July 8. That will be one extra day.

OFFICIAL RESIDENCE FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 202) designating the premises occupied by the Chief of Naval Operations as the official residence of the Vice President, effective upon the termination of service of the incumbent Chief of Naval Operations.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 202) with Mr. ROBERTS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the Senate joint resolution was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRAY), will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation before the committee today is Senate Joint Resolution No. 202, to provide an official residence for the Vice President of the United States. The Armed Services Committee by a vote of 26 ayes to 1 nay recommended enactment of Senate Joint Resolution No. 202 as amended.

The purpose of this legislation is to designate the premises presently occupied by the Chief of Naval Operations as a "temporary" official residence for the Vice President of the United States. It authorizes the Administrator of the General Services Administration to provide for the care, maintenance, repair, improvement, and furnishing of the official residence and grounds. It further authorizes such appropriations as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing purposes and requires that, during the interim period before such funds are appropriated, the Department of the Navy shall make provision for staffing and other appropriate purposes.

Over 100 Members of the House co-sponsored similar resolutions, so there is obviously very little, if any, controversy over the objectives of this legislation.

Under current circumstances, the Vice President must provide his own residence at such location he deems desirable and is within his means. Such a residence must be properly secured by the Secret Service to assure the proper protection of the Vice President and his family. This is often difficult to do, and can only be accomplished at reoccurring expense to the taxpayers. During the past 6 years, there have been three Vice Presidents. There will be another in 2½ years. These security expenditures will continue to be necessary in the future unless an official residence is provided.

The amendment adopted by the committee, in the form of a substitute for the language passed by the Senate, differed from the Senate proposal in three major aspects:

First, It places responsibility for the care and maintenance of the residence in the General Services Administration;

Second, It clearly contemplates that the residence for the Vice President be "temporary" pending construction of a new residence on the grounds; and

Third, It, unlike the Senate bill, does not repeal Public Law 89-386 which authorizes the construction of a permanent residence for the Vice President in the District of Columbia.

The resolution, as passed by the Senate, would place the responsibility for the custody, control, and maintenance of the residence and grounds to be occupied by the Vice President under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Navy. Despite the fact that the responsibility for the staffing, maintenance, and operation of these premises is now, and has been for many years, under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Navy, the committee believes that these responsibilities should be transferred to the Administrator of the General Services Administration during the period that this residence is occupied by the Vice President.

Further, the committee felt that the provision in the Senate-passed resolution repealing Public Law 89-386, which authorizes construction of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States in the District of Columbia, which was section 6 in the original House resolution and section 7 in the Senate-passed resolution, should not be included in the final version of this legislation. Our committee does not see the wisdom in repealing existing legislation which should be utilized in the next few years to construct a permanent resident on the grounds of the Naval Observatory for the Vice President. That is the reason the committee included in the language of the resolution a qualification that the present residence of the Chief of Naval Operations would be the official "temporary" residence of the Vice President. The committee believes that when the Vice President moves into a permanent residence and vacates the temporary official residence, that it should revert to the Navy Department for its further use as determined by the Secretary of the Navy.

As set forth in the committee report this bill will provide for an immediate residence for the Vice President at a cost of approximately \$15,000 for minimal renovations and redecorations and approximately \$33,000 for security equipment and installation. Thus, the legislation contemplates an estimated cost of approximately \$48,000 to provide an immediate residence for the Vice President on a temporary basis.

In summary, I recommend enactment of this legislation to provide an official residence on a temporary basis for the Vice President until the Congress sees fit to appropriate funds for the construction of a permanent residence as authorized in Public Law 89-386. I urge unanimous support for this legislation.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that I certainly am not opposed to a home for the Vice President. I think it is

H 5063

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 12, 1974

long overdue, and we should have one. Yet I do have some concerns about the possible costs we are going to get involved in here to provide for something on a temporary basis. It is my understanding there has already been \$73,000 spent on the Vice President's home in Alexandria, and that another \$8,300 has been spent for security in his home on top of that.

Now, what is "temporary," and what is "permanent?" Will the gentleman tell me, when does something become permanent?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the reference to "temporary" here denotes that the present facilities comprising the residence of the Chief of Naval Operations would be a temporary home for the Vice President. The home itself is the key to the reference of "temporary."

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, the thing that concerns me and other Members of the Committee is that we were given a set of figures as to what it would cost in the event this were to be a permanent residence.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. The gentleman is correct. We were given a set of figures as to what the actual cost would be if the Vice President moved in, as quickly as possible, to the existing facilities, and that cost would be \$15,000 for the minimal renovations that would be required, including the redecorations, and so forth, and approximately \$33,000 for security equipment and installation, and that makes a total of about \$48,000.

Now, we were given other figures. We received other figures, and we were told these were in the event the Vice President should make this a permanent residence, and then it would come to a figure that could perhaps go up to about \$762,000.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. That is right.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the representative of the General Services Administration gave us those figures. They are here in another report.

Those figures would be as follows: \$276,000 for improvements to the Capitol area; \$359,000 for permanent installations for protective purposes, the command post, lights, alarms, and so forth; and \$127,000 for protective equipment, making a total of about \$762,000.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. The gentleman is correct. That is \$762,000 that we would have to expend if we were to make it a permanent residence for all Vice Presidents.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. The gentleman is assuring the House today that the expenses of this type are definitely not to be considered as expenses for the temporary residence of the Vice President?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this is what this legislation calls for. This is the thinking of everyone who has studied this matter, and the feeling is that it would be a very unwise thing to make the present home of the Chief of Naval Operations the permanent residence for the Vice President. We do look

forward to the day when we will comply with the provisions of Public Law 89-386, authorizing the construction of an official residence for the Vice President. This is what we think provides a permanent solution.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, can the gentleman tell us what the plans are for the Chief of Naval Operations now? Is he going to move back into this residence when the Vice President's permanent home is built?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. This is something which is to be decided in the future. For the present, he is going to move to a home on the naval base here.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman will recall that the testimony by the Navy was that if that were done, it is going to take about \$125,000 to renovate the home of the Chief of Naval Operations which he is moving into on the naval base.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I think that is right. I have no quarrel with the figure the gentleman has mentioned.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Again I would just like to say that I wish we could get started on the permanent home of the Vice President. I think we need one; I think it is long overdue.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. It was four Congresses ago that the House made that determination, but there have never been any funds allocated for it.

Mr. ICHORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ICHORD. I strongly support the concept of a Vice Presidential home. However, I am one of the five who voted against this legislation in the committee. The reason why I did was because of the fact that I heard about the Navy using this bill to come back to lay the groundwork for building another expensive mansion for the Naval Chief of Staff. That was the reason for my vote, as a protest.

I understand from the staff now that the Navy has abandoned any ideas at this time of asking the committee and the Congress in the public works construction bill for a new mansion for the Naval Chief of Staff. Is that correct?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. The gentleman is correct. The Navy at no time was the one that fostered this idea or even suggested the use of the home of the Chief of Naval Operations. I think perhaps the Navy might be a little reluctant even because of the possibility of somebody just staying there, and the Navy would then be losing the property entirely.

Mr. ICHORD. I just want to serve notice that if the Navy does come in here asking for a new mansion for the Chief of Staff of the Navy, they will have considerable opposition. I think we should spend that money on hardware and many other things to fight a possible war with, rather than building a new mansion for the Naval Chief of Staff. We have plenty of homes available that could be rehabilitated for the Naval Chief of Staff.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Let me quote a few figures that show the wisdom of finally putting into effect the provisions of Public Law 98-386. Since 1964 there are some expenditures on maintenance of homes for the Vice President.

The Government spent \$123,193 for various security matters and work on the residence of the Vice President in Minnesota and his apartment here. These are all involved in the area of security. In the Agnew administration there was \$175,000 spent by the GSA for renovation and other things connected in some way with the installation of security measures. The GSA spent \$175,000 and the Secret Service spent \$70,000, so there is a total of \$245,000 in the Agnew administration.

So far for Vice President Ford the GSA spent \$73,400 and the Secret Service spent \$8,465, for a total of \$81,000. This is all related to renovations necessary for the installation of security and protection devices.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I merely want to point out that the gentleman referred to the GSA's architectural plans. A few years, in the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the Committee on Appropriations, the subcommittee which I head, the GSA recommended \$1 million or \$1.5 million for architectural plans for the building of a mansion at the same site for the Vice President, at that time Vice President Agnew. It was debated in the committee and there was a very close vote, and we went to the full committee with it and debated it again. The gentleman from Ohio rose and said that we love our Vice President Agnew, but we love economy more.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against this because it will be very costly in the long run.

So the matter was deleted, it was taken out in the committee at that time. The GSA had plans for an elaborate mansion for the Vice President. We did not do this for Vice President Johnson, or for Vice President HUMPHREY, and while I have the highest regard for the present Vice President, I do not believe we should do this.

As a matter of fact, when President Nixon nominated the now Vice President I was the first to publicly announce my support for him in my State, and I of course did vote for him. So my vote in opposition to this legislation means no reflection of my high regard for the present Vice President. I simply object to this because this would open the door to a very costly and elaborate mansion building for the Vice Presidency.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in a somewhat unaccustomed role here today because the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD) who voted against this in the committee, and was one of

June 10, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — DAILY DIGEST

D 665

DÉTENTE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Europe held a hearing on Détente: Soviet immigration; and President's visit to the Soviet Union. Testimony was heard from Prof. Hans Morgenthau, City University of New York.

FUELS AND ENERGY CONSERVATION

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Subcommittee on Environment continued hearings on H.R. 11343, National Fuels and Energy Conservation Act. Testimony was heard from FEA Administrator John Sawhill; and Commerce Assistant Secretary Sidney Jones.

Hearings were adjourned subject to call.

HEALTH MANPOWER AND HEALTH PLANNING

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment met for markup of Health Manpower and Health Planning legislation, and will resume tomorrow.

FISHERMEN'S PROTECTIVE ACT AMENDMENT

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment held a hearing on H.R. 15039, to amend the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 in order to strengthen the import restrictions which may be imposed to deter foreign countries from conducting fishing operations which adversely affect international fishery conservation programs. Testimony was heard from Department and public witnesses.

Hearings were adjourned subject to call.

COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL ACT

Committee on Rules: Granted an open rule providing for the consideration of and 1 hour of general debate, making the committee substitute in order as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, providing that the substitute be read for amendment by titles instead of by sections, and waiving points of order against section 205 of the substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI, on H.R. 12165, Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act. Testimony was heard from Representatives Johnson of California and Lujan.

RESIDENCE FOR VICE PRESIDENT

Committee on Rules: Granted an open rule providing for the consideration of and 1 hour of general debate, making the committee substitute in order as an original joint resolution for the purpose of amendment, and waiving points of order against section 4 of the substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI, on S.J. Res. 202, designating the

premises occupied by the Chief of Naval Operations as the official residence of the Vice President, effective upon the termination of service of the incumbent Chief of Naval Operations. Testimony was heard from Representatives Price of Illinois and Bray.

MILITARY ACADEMY TRAINEE

Committee on Rules: Granted an open rule providing for the consideration of and 1 hour of general debate, and providing that after the passage of H.J. Res. 876 it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution S.J. Res. 206 and to consider said Senate joint resolution in the House, on H.J. Res. 876, authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the U.S. Military Academy one citizen of the Kingdom of Laos. Testimony was heard from Representatives Fisher and Holt.

INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY ACT AUTHORIZATION

Committee on Rules: Granted an open rule providing for the consideration of and 1 hour of general debate on H.R. 13839, authorizing appropriations for carrying out the provisions of the International Economic Policy Act of 1972. Testimony was heard from Representatives Ashley and Frenzel.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK CREDIT

Committee on Rules: Held a hearing but postponed action on H. Res. 774, declaring the sense of the House with respect to a prohibition of extension of credit by the Export-Import Bank of the United States. Testimony was heard from Representatives Ashley and Frenzel.

TAX REFORM

Committee on Ways and Means: Continued markup of tax reform legislation, and will resume tomorrow.

Joint Committee Meeting

PENSION REFORM

Conferees continued in executive session to resolve the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions of H.R. 2, to revise the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, but did not reach final agreement and will meet again tomorrow.

BILLS SIGNED BY THE PRESIDENT

New Laws

(For last listing of public laws, see DIGEST, p. D627, June 3, 1974)

Approved For Release 2007/02/07 : CIA-RDP75B00380R000500110005-4
S. 2044, to study and make uniform the system for collection of certain recreation use fees on Federal lands. Signed June 7, 1974 (Public Law 93-303).

CIA INTERNAL USE ONLY **CONFIDENTIAL**

Journal - Office of Legislative Counsel
Friday - 3 May 1974

Page 3

25X1

8. [] After conversations with [] and David Blee, I called Roger Lewis, in the office of Representative Morris Udall, to discuss further with him the matter involving Ron Ridenhour who is writing an article for an underground magazine New Times on the operation of [] See Memo for Record.

25X1

25X1A

25X1

9. [] Received a call from Sven Kraemer, NSC Staff, advising a Legislative Interdepartmental Group meeting has been called for next Tuesday, 7 May at 3:00 p.m., in the Roosevelt Room of the White House. He said they would be discussing the Foreign Assistance and Defense Procurement Acts but also would be interested in our views on the Freedom of Information Act. In addition Kraemer asked if we thought a representative of Department of Justice should be invited to speak on this issue. I said indeed I did feel that Justice should be present and suggested the name of Robert L. Salaschin as a possible Justice representative. We also discussed several other topics that might be brought up such as the Muskie/Kennedy/Ervin Subcommittee inquiry into surveillance of U.S. citizens and the Agency's legislation for protection of intelligence sources and methods.

25X1A

25X1A

25X1
25X1A

10. [] As a follow up to a call from [] who told me that Jack Ticer, Senate Armed Services Committee staff, had expressed surprise today []

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

[] that the Agency is not the sponsor of the private bill for [] I gave Ticer a brief rundown on the history of the bill and [] relationship as [] In brief, Ticer indicated that it would appear to be lost time to put a separate bill into the Senate at this time, if the House bill is expected to move right after clearance of the procurement bill by the House committee. There is no follow up necessary from this conversation.

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

25X1

11. [] Together with [] [] met with Richard A. Shaw, Chief Investigator and John E. Manning, Investigator, House Committee on Internal Security, and discussed with them in general terms the case of [] Shaw will write the case up for presentation to the Chairman by the Staff Director and will recommend a staff meeting [] late in the week to be followed by open hearings at a date to be determined. Shaw will call me as soon as the case has been presented to Chairman Richard H. Ichord (D., Mo.).

25X1A

25X1A

CIA INTERNAL USE ONLY

CONFIDENTIAL

25X1A

Approved For Release 2007/02/07 : CIA-RDP75B00380R000500110005-4

Next 3 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2007/02/07 : CIA-RDP75B00380R000500110005-4

CIA INTERNAL USE ONLY CONFIDENTIAL

JOURNAL

OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

Tuesday, 5 February 1974

Leg fi

25X1A

25X1

25X1A

1. [] At the request of []
Acting Chief, [] I called Ralph Marshall, staff member,
House Armed Services Committee, to determine the status of any
legislation to permit students from Southeast Asia to enter our military
academies. According to Marshall, a law was passed in 1966 to enter
a small number of these students through 1970. An effort to renew the
program failed Senate passage in 1972. [] advised.

25X1A

25X1

3. [] Talked to Mr. St. George, of the
commercial reporting firm of Ward & Paul, and told him that the time
delay is such that we would not be able to use the reporting services that
I had discussed with Mr. Ward last evening.

25X1

4. [] Met with Mel Miller, Deputy Chief of
Staff, House Select Committees on Committees, and received from him
committee prints of the proposed committee structure and procedures
of the House of Representatives.

25X1

5. [] I met with Herb Roback, Staff Director,
House Government Operations Committee, and gave him a copy of the
New York Times article of 20 January concerning the National Caucus of
Labor Committees. Representatives of the National Caucus have started
bothering various members of the Committee concerning oversight of
the Central Intelligence Agency the Government Operations Committee.
I gave Roback also a copy of Representative Jack Brooks' (D., Tex.) letter
dated 29 January 1974. Roback expressed the opinion that the Agency
should make whatever effort is possible to resolve Brooks' questions
directly with him and asked that he be kept up-to-date on this matter.

2. IMPDET CL IN []

25X1A

Approved For Release 2007/02/07 : CIA-RDP75B00380R000500110005-4

Approved For Release 2007/02/07 : CIA-RDP75B00380R000500110005-4

CONFIDENTIAL

Le Jr

Journal - Office of Legislative Counsel
Monday - 10 December 1973

Page 2

25X1

3. [] Met with Frank Slatinshek, Chief Counsel, House Armed Services Committee, and filled him in on my meeting with Chairman Nedzi, Intelligence Subcommittee. I also briefed him on the Director's correspondence with Chairman Lee Hamilton, Subcommittee on Near East and South Asia, House Foreign Affairs Committee, concerning the alert of American forces during the Middle East crisis. Slatinshek asked if possible if he could see a copy of the correspondence.

I briefed Slatinshek on the Agency's negotiations with GSA on SLUC. Due to time limitations we didn't get into detail but he asked that we discuss it further. In his opinion the position taken by GSA is complete nonsense. As Chairman Nedzi had done, Slatinshek noted the Agency should not expect very much help from OMB in either the SLUC or the Renegotiation Board Air America problems.

I discussed with Slatinshek the presentation before the full Committee tomorrow morning on S. 2714 the CIARDS cost of living bill. Slatinshek will attempt to field any questions coming from the full Committee in order to avoid getting into classified information.

25X1

4. [] Met with Ralph Preston, Staff Assistant, House Appropriations Committee, and made an appointment for Wednesday, 12 December at 10:00 a.m. for [] Comptroller, and [] Deputy. Preston asked that the other meetings tentatively scheduled for this week be put off at least until next week due to the press of Committee business.

Preston's assistant, Marcia Matt, is checking the files for material relating to the restrictions imposed on the Defense Department in shipment of foreign-made privately owned vehicles. [] D/SSA/DDM&S, has been advised.

25X1

5. [] Received a call from Bruce Merkel, in the office of Representative William Bray, who asked if I would come by and pick up a letter that Bray is sending to an Agency employee.

25X1

6. [] Called General Ray Furlong, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs, and asked him the status of legislation providing foreign billets to West Point. []

[] General Furlong said he would check and let us know.